

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/646,017	08/22/2003	Michael T. Rossides	8988	
7590 06/01/2006		EXAMINER		
Michael T. Rossides			CROSS, ALAN	
11167 E. Mirasol Circle Scottsdale, AZ 85255			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3713	
		DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
0.55° A 4° . O	10/646,017	ROSSIDES, MICHAEL T.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Alan Cross	3713			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versilities to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 A	ugust 2003.				
,	action is non-final.				
·—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o 					
Application Papers					
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				
S. Patent and Trademark Office					

Application/Control Number: 10/646,017

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The references cited in the specification have been considered, but will not be listed on any patent resulting from this application because they were not provided on a separate list in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1). In order to have the references printed on such resulting patent, a separate listing, preferably on a PTO/SB/08A and 08B form, must be filed within the set period for reply to this Office action.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The listing of disclosure documents 512686, 623794, and 535992 needs to be specified on what these documents really are.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Application/Control Number: 10/646,017

Art Unit: 3713

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6443841. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of the application discloses the same method taught in claim 1 of Rossides.

Regarding the limitation of "at least two products being compared... product contest", Rossides shows this limitation since the mere art of betting on anything inherently compares multiple products, such as comparing a field of racing horses or comparing two sports teams competing amongst one another.

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10442794. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claims disclose the same invention and the claim language does not distinguish one from another.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Application/Control Number: 10/646,017

Art Unit: 3713

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rossides (US Patent #5575474). Rossides discloses a method for operating a computer database system comprised in combination of the following processes (col. 7, 20-23): (a) a process for creating a bet: defining a contest between one or more products, defining a comparison process for judging the contest, said comparison process defining possible comparison outcomes (col. 9, 42-50), iii. defining bet transaction rules for risking money on the outcome of the contest (col. 9, 54-60), (b) a process for finding and viewing the bet contest (col. 8, 52-60), (c) a process for making bet offers for risking money on the contest (col. 8, 61-65), (d) a process for matching up bet offers (col. 8, 52-60), (e) a process for triggering the judging of the contest (col. 12, 25-38), (e) a process for judging the contest (col. 12, 44-55), (g) a process for dividing money risked in the contest according to the result of said judging, and according to said bet transaction rules (col. 13, 5-12), (h) whereby, viewers of the betting on the contest, and of the result, if any, of the contest obtain valuable information for comparing the products in said contest (col. 4, 16-20).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alan Cross whose telephone number is 571-272-5529. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4 M-F.

Art Unit: 3713

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on 571-272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ARC 571-272-5529

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER